1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FILED NASHVILLE DIVISION			
2		NASHVILLE DIVIS	BION	U.S. DISTRICT COURT
3				MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENN.
4	EDWIN BORLAY, et al,)))	
5	Plaint	tiffs,)) 	DEPUTY CLERK
6	vs.	•)	CASE NO.	3:02-0382
7	PRIMUS AUTOMOTIVE FIR	NANCTAL)) 	
8	SERVICES, et al,)		
9	Defend	dants.))	
10				
11				
12				
13	EXCERPT OF PROCEEDINGS			
		VOLUME A		
14				
15				
16				
17				
18	BEFORE:	THE HONORABI	LE ALETA A	. TRAUGER
19	DATE:	MARCH 16, 20	005	
20	TIME:	9:00 A.M.		
21			•	
22				
23	REPORTED BY:	BEVERLY E.		
24		OFFICIAL COU A-837 U.S. (
25		NASHVILLE, 7 (615) 207-81	rn 37203	

1	A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S			
2				
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:	MICHAEL E. TERRY 209 Tenth Avenue South		
4		Cummins Station, Suite 310 Nashville, TN 37203		
5		CLINTON W. WATKINS		
6		5214 Maryland Way, Suite 402 Brentwood, TN 37027		
7		JOHN T. CROWDER, JR.		
8		R. EDWIN LAMBERTH Cunningham, Bounds, Yance		
9		Crowder & Brown, LLC P.O. Box 66705		
10		Mobile, AL 36660		
11		WYMAN O. GILMORE, JR. JOHN BARNEY		
12		Gilmore Law Office P.O. Box 729		
13		Grove Hill, AL 36451		
14		STUART ROSSMAN National Consumer Law Center		
15		77 Summer Street FL 10 Boston, MA 02110		
16		BOSCON, MA 02110		
17	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	THOMAS M. BYRNE DANIEL H. SCHLUETER		
18		VALERIE S. SANDERS ROCCO TESTANI		
19		Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan 999 Peachtree Street, N.E.		
20		Atlanta, GA 30309		
21		ANITA L. WHISNANT Primus Automotive Financial		
22		Services, Inc. 9009 Carothers Parkway		
23		P.O. Box 680100 Franklin, TN 37067		
24		FIGURELIN, IN 3/00/		
25				

THE COURT: Thank you for those closing arguments. They have reinforced my view of what I'm going to do in this case. I came out of the trial with this view. I have spent days reviewing the evidence, and the arguments have, as I say, reinforced my view.

I will be issuing an injunction in this case.

However, this is what I would like to do from this point on.

Before issuing what will be a lengthy, I hope well reasoned and well supported decision, supporting my issuance of the injunction, I would like for the parties to attempt something.

I guess I'm jumping over your first step,

Mr. Watkins, and if I end up issuing an opinion, I will give
you an opportunity to give me revised findings of fact that
are supported by not -- not the things that were filed
before the trial but basically the testimony in the trial,
and the exhibits in the trial, and post-trial briefs; I will
give both parties an opportunity to do that.

However, this is what I would like for you to engage in for 30 days, and that is an effort to structure relief.

And you gave me some nice quotes from case law this morning, Mr. Watkins, that reinforced that that's what I would like to happen in this case. And let me preface this with the fact that the defendants by agreeing to the

structure of the relief would not be waiving their right to appeal my decision, of course.

However, as the <u>Brown vs. Board of Education</u> said, equitable remedies are a special blend of what's necessary, fair and workable. And the parties, especially the defendant knows a whole lot better what is workable than the court does.

The Parma case talks about preserving the freedom and flexibility of the defendant. I would like to do that to the extent that we can.

And I would like to be no more intrusive than necessary. And so it seems to me that therefore the parties, particularly Primus, is in the best position to discuss with the plaintiffs the appropriate relief that could be ordered in this case if I end up having to do that.

Obviously, there's the possibility that in having these discussions, you will settle the case, and I will never enter an opinion or an injunction.

At this point, it might be the plaintiffs that would be more resistant to that than the defendants, although I have observed the dynamic to be the opposite before trial. However, one always leaves open that possibility.

I would like to give you until April 18 to give me a joint proposal about how the remedy could be structured in

this case. I would like to have by April 4 a status report as to whether you are making progress on that request of the court.

If you have come to total loggerheads and all we're headed for is an appeal of my decision, then I want to know that so that I can then set a schedule for the filing of proposed findings of fact and post-trial briefs.

So I would like a status report by April 4. I would like an agreed joint proposal on the structure that the remedy might take in this case.

I fervently hope that you will engage in good faith discussions about this remedy. I am of the opinion that courts ought not to overly intrude and tinker in the details of something like this. I would much prefer that I get a proposal from the parties here.

However, if I am put to it, I will decide how I will structure the remedy in this case. What I have decided is that the plaintiffs have proved their case and that they will win in my decision.

So I will issue a brief order that sets out this procedure. I'm not going to set the briefing schedule at this point. I will set it at a later point.

So I appreciate your all coming back today and engaging in what was a process I felt I needed to have before making this ruling. So we're in recess.

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BEVERLY E. "BECKY" COLE, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, with offices at Nashville, do hereby certify:

That I reported on the stenotype shorthand machine the proceedings held on March 16, 2005, in the matter of EDWIN BORLAY, et al vs. PRIMUS AUTOMOTIVE FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC. et al; Case No. 3:02-0382;

That an excerpt from said proceedings in connection with the hearing was reduced to typewritten form by me;

That the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings to the best of my skills and abilities;

This the 16th day of March, 2005.

Beverly E. Cole, RPR CER